

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

To:

TRANSLATION
PCT

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

(PCT Rule 43bis.1)

Applicant's or agent's file reference SAI.203.10WO		Date of mailing (day/month/year) See Form PCT/ISA/210 (sheet 2)
FOR FURTHER ACTION See paragraph 2 below		
International application No. PCT/EP2005/003194	International filing date (day/month/year) 24.03.2005	Priority date (day/month/year) 06.04.2004
International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC <div style="text-align: center;">E05F11/48, E05F15/16</div>		
Applicant FAURECIA INNENRAUM SYSTEME GMBH		

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. I	Basis of the opinion
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. II	Priority
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. III	Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. IV	Lack of unity of invention
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. V	Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VI	Certain documents cited
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VII	Certain defects in the international application
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VIII	Certain observations on the international application

2. **FURTHER ACTION**

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA/IEP	Authorized officer
Facsimile No.	Telephone No.

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/EP2005/003194

Box No. 1

Basis of this opinion

1. With regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.
☐ This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language
_____, which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rule 12.3 and 23.1(b)).
2. With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
 - a. type of material
☐ a sequence listing
☐ table(s) related to the sequence listing
 - b. format of material
☐ in written format
☐ in computer readable form
 - c. time of filing/furnishing
☐ contained in the international application as filed.
☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.
3. ☐ In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table(s) relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.
4. Additional comments:

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/EP2005/003194

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability:
citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Claims	<u>1-16</u>	YES
	Claims	_____	NO
Inventive step (IS)	Claims	<u>1-16</u>	YES
	Claims	_____	NO
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims	<u>1-16</u>	YES
	Claims	_____	NO

2. Citations and explanations:

1 Reference is made to the following documents:

D1: US 2002/007596 A1 (CABANNE DAMIEN ET AL.)
24 January 2002 (2002-01-24)

D2: EP-A-0 724 060 (GRUPO ANTOLIN-INGENIERIA, S.A.)
31 July 1996 (1996-07-31)

D3: EP-A-0 579 535 (FRANCE DESIGN SOCIETE ANONYME)
19 January 1994 (1994-01-19)

2.1 D1, which is considered the closest prior art,
discloses (cf. column 3, line 11 - column 4,
line 23; figures 2, 3) a drum housing for a motor
vehicle, with a receiving region for a cable drum
which is driven either by an electric or a manual
window lifter drive.

The subject matter of claim 1, clarified as per
BOX VIII, differs from that described in D1 in that
the drum housing has two coaxial drum receptacles
with different diameters.

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/EP2005/003194

Box No. V

Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability;
citations and explanations supporting such statement

2.2 It is the object of the invention to adapt the drum housing in such a manner that it can be used more universally.

The combination of features of claim 1 permits the use of the same drum housing for cable drums which can have different diameters in accordance with the manual or motor drive; i.e., because of the possibility of using cable drums with different diameters, only less complicated step-down gears are required (or the step-down gear is omitted).

The combination of features is neither known from the available prior art nor is it rendered obvious by it.

The subject matter of claim 1 therefore meets the criteria mentioned in PCT Article 33(2) and (3).

3. The subject matter of claims 2-16, where claims 8 and 15 have all of the features of claim 1, is novel and inventive because they are dependent on claim 1.

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/EP2005/003194

Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application

The following defects in the form or contents of the international application have been noted:

1. Claims 1, 8 and 15 are drafted as separate independent claims. However, claims 8 and 15 have all of the features of claim 1. For this reason, the claims are not concise and do not meet the requirements of PCT Article 6.
2. Independent claim 1 should have been drafted in the two-part form defined by PCT Rule 6.3(b).

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/EP2005/003194

Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

The following observations on the clarity of the claims, description, and drawings or on the question whether the claims are fully supported by the description, are made:

1. The application does not meet the requirements of PCT Article 6 because claim 1 is unclear for the following reasons:
 - 1.1 The relationship between the first and the second diameter is unclear because the difference between the diameters is not provided.
 - 1.2 Furthermore, on the one hand, the concentric arrangement of the two cable-drum receiving regions along the axis of rotation of the cable drum and, on the other hand, the first region designed with a large diameter are defined as essential features (description, page 3, line 24: "according to the invention").

To eliminate the above objections with regard to clarity, the wording on page 3/lines 26-29 of the description should have been included in claim 1.
2. Dependent claims 8 and 15 include all of the features of claim 1 and should have been formulated as dependent claims.